

## **REMARKS**

The amendment to the specification simply inserts the patent number of an application previously identified only by serial number.

Claims 1-29 are present in this application. Claims 12-29 stand withdrawn from consideration as directed to a non-elected invention and have now been formally cancelled without prejudice to applicants' rights to file divisional and/or continuation applications directed to the subject matter of these cancelled claims.

Claims 1-11 stand rejected. Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate a modified version of the language of claim 3. Claim 3 has been cancelled. Claim 5 has been amended in a manner parallel to claim 1, and claim 7 has been cancelled. Claims 2, 4, 6, 8 and 9-11 are unchanged.

As already noted, claim 1 has been amended to incorporate a modified version of the language of claim 3. During the preparation of this Amendment, it was realized that the original language of claim 3 was inconsistent with Figure 2 and with Paragraph [0066] of the specification, in that each capacitor electrode 114 forms a capacitor with the adjacent portion of the associated column electrode C (the "voltage supply line" referred to in claim 1), and not with the first or pixel electrode 104 as stated in claim 3. The language used in claims 1 and 5 is now consistent with Figure 2 and Paragraph [0066] of the specification.

No new matter is introduced by the foregoing amendments.

In view of the foregoing amendments to the claims, the only parts of the 35 USC 102 rejections in the Office Action which are not moot are those relating to original claims 3 and 7, namely the first paragraph on page 4 and the second complete paragraph on page 5 of the Action. These rejections are traversed. More specifically, these rejections are traversed on the grounds that Te Velde et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,681,403, does not describe a backplane for an electro-optic display having a capacitor electrode which forms a capacitor with a voltage supply line, as required by all the present claims.

The Office Action states that Te Velde teaches a backplane comprising a capacitor electrode disposed adjacent the first electrode such that the capacitor electrode and the first electrode form a capacitor, and directs attention to Figure 5, which shows a first picture electrode and a second picture electrode forming a capacitor. With respect, Figure 5 of Te Velde shows the pixel (or picture) electrode forming a capacitor with the front electrode of the display, with the electro-optic medium forming a dielectric between the two electrodes. This type of capacitor is inherent in any electro-optic display. However, the present claims require the presence of a capacitor electrode in a backplane of an electro-optic display, and the front electrode is manifestly not part of the backplane. In other words, the present claims inherently require in a backplane a capacitor electrode which is separate from both the pixel electrode and the front electrode. Secondly and more importantly, the present claims now require that the capacitor electrode form a capacitor with a voltage supply line, not with a front electrode. There is no suggestion in Te Velde that a capacitor electrode be provided that forms a capacitor with a voltage supply line, and for this reason Te Velde does not anticipate any of the present claims.

For the foregoing reasons, the 35 USC 102 rejection is unjustified and should be withdrawn.

Reconsideration and allowance of all claims remaining in this application is respectfully requested.

Since the period prescribed for responding to the Office Action expired July 12, a Petition for a three month extension of this period is filed herewith.

Respectfully submitted  
/David J. Cole/  
David J. Cole  
Registration No. 29629

E INK Corporation  
733 Concord Avenue  
Cambridge MA 02138

Telephone (617) 499-6069  
Fax (617) 499-6200  
E-mail dcole@eink.com